Case 1:16-cr-00278-WHP Document 28 Filed 10/14/16 Page 1 of 62

G9u1schs UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 16 Cr. 278 (WHP) V. 5 STUART SCHLESINGER, 6 Defendant. Sentencing 7 ----x 8 New York, N.Y. September 30, 2016 9 2:38 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. WILLIAM H. PAULEY III, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 BY: MATTHEW J. LAROCHE, ESQ. 17 Assistant United States Attorney LAW OFFICES OF MURRAY RICHMAN 18 Attorneys for Defendant BY: MURRAY RICHMAN, ESQ. 19 KAREN L. DEL VECCHIO, ESQ. 20 21 ALSO PRESENT: JAMES HILLIARD, Special Agent, FBI 22 23 24 25

1	(Case called)
2	MR. LAROCHE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Matt
3	Laroche for the government. And with me is Special Agent James
4	Hilliard from the FBI.
5	THE COURT: Good afternoon, gentlemen.
6	MR. HILLIARD: Good afternoon.
7	MR. RICHMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Murray
8	Richman for defendant. And I'm assisted by my associate Karen
9	Del Vecchio.
10	THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Richman
11	and Ms. Del Vecchio.
12	MS. DEL VECCHIO: Good afternoon.
13	THE COURT: I note the presence of the defendant,
14	Mr. Schlesinger, at counsel table.
15	This matter is on for sentencing. Are the parties
16	ready to proceed?
17	MR. LAROCHE: Yes, your Honor.
18	MR. RICHMAN: We are.
19	THE COURT: Mr. Richman, have you reviewed with your
20	client the presentence investigation report?
21	MR. RICHMAN: I have, sir.
22	THE COURT: Are there any factual matters set forth in
23	the report that you believe warrant modification or correction?
24	MR. RICHMAN: I do not, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Laroche, are there any factual matters

G9u1schs

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the report that the government believes warrant modification or correction?

MR. LAROCHE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before we proceed, with respect to the question of restitution, the parties have handed up to the Court a Consent Preliminary Order of Forfeiture in the amount of \$5,549,017. Is that the agreed amount of restitution in this case?

MR. LAROCHE: Yes, your Honor.

MR. RICHMAN: It is, your Honor, subject to certain materials we're making available to the United States Attorney's Office with relation to a modification of a portion thereof, but not a significant portion thereof.

THE COURT: All right. Very well.

Before I hear from the parties in this case, the government has informed me that a number of victims wish to address the Court. I intend to hear from each of them now. have read all of the submissions of the parties and the numerous letters that I've received from victims, including one letter that was handed up to my deputy a half hour ago. I assume, Mr. Richman, that you've seen them all.

MR. RICHMAN: I have seen them all, your Honor, and I have received a copy of the one that was handed up a half hour ago.

THE COURT: Very well. And so I've been provided with

1 a 1

a list. I'm going to ask Margaret Last and/or Kevin Last to come forward, if they wish, and address the Court.

Please just state your name, if you would.

MS. LAST: My name is Margaret Last.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. LAST: And I want to thank you, your Honor, for letting me speak.

I am a victim of Stuart Schlesinger. After a negligent malpractice incident in 2010, I sought the help of Julien & Schlesinger law firm. Previously this law firm helped me in an accident case in 2009. I worked with his son, Michael Schlesinger, and other lawyers in the firm during the standard process of a lawsuit, until the award settlement stage came to fruition. Stuart Schlesinger handled all financial awards.

I cannot count how many times I spoke to Stuart regarding the status of both cases. His excuses were neverending — he was short-staffed, he was making sure everything was in order, he had a virus, he had problems with his back, and his knee, the office was moving, he didn't know how to work a fax machine, the girl in the office must have made an error, he didn't want to speak on the phone too long, etc.

The frustration level was all-consuming physically and emotionally. I was trying my best to recover from the numerous surgeries I needed from the malpractice suit. I lost my job.

My husband had to take early retirement to take care of me during these numerous surgeries. Stuart knew all this information and expressed empathy to both me and my husband. He was reassuring that I would receive a very good settlement out of court.

A settlement of the malpractice was made. I received a call from Stuart to finalize the amount. I received an award of \$875,000. The check was hand delivered to Stuart within two days after the conclusion of the settlement on June 2nd. Stuart said it would be \$660,100 I was to receive. I was relieved and believed things would work for us. I called Stuart numerous times. He said he had no set date when I would receive my award. Stuart expressed on several conversations that he wanted to make sure all the paperwork was in order and that should be shortly. It never came.

I became very restless and nervous. I could not sleep. My husband was aggravated and felt Stuart was up to something. We found out Stuart was disbarred through a news site on the internet. Stuart claimed this was -- claimed to us everything would be okay. During November -- that everything would be okay.

During November and early December, we called almost daily. On every call, Stuart claimed he was meeting people to get funds. Stuart even set up a meeting to meet me and my husband at a coffee shop. He gave us a phony check and asked

1 | t

that we not cash it for two weeks. Within two weeks, Stuart was arrested by the FBI. I was physically and emotionally wrecked.

I am frightened as to how we will be able to suffice paying ongoing medical bills, our monthly bills, and many other bills. Stuart Schlesinger stole from me, like a common thief.

I was so hurt by him and angry with myself for believing him.

I will never be able to forgive him for what he's done to me and my family.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mrs. Last.

MR. LAST: I'm Kevin Last, your Honor. Thank you for letting me speak.

I'm a victim of Stuart A. Schlesinger.

In 2011, my wife and I met with the son of Stuart A. Schlesinger, Michael Schlesinger, and signed a formal agreement with the law firm Julien & Schlesinger, to sue a doctor who misdiagnosed my wife. I did some due diligence on the firm, and it was rated one of the top ten law firms in New York City for malpractice cases. I had no idea at this time that Stuart Schlesinger was stealing from his clients.

My wife was close to a below-the-knee amputation on the right leg and sepsis. In order to save her, the now treating doctor performed a series of surgeries that left her in a wheelchair for nine months with 36 bolts and pins

protruding from the right leg. I was emotionally devastated it see her like this. She did not have a good recovery and to this day needs constant assistance. I had to leave work and take care of her.

In 2012, my wife lost her job, and I was not working. Numerous bills were coming in. Both my wife and I did everything Stuart Schlesinger asked of us, and he told us that we would get a settlement that would help our financial situation.

In June of 2015, Stuart Schlesinger called us at home and said the case settled for \$875,000. We received a letter from the defendant's insurance company stating the check was sent to our lawyer. I called Stuart Schlesinger immediately and asked for the money. Stuart gave me many excuses why he could not pay us, including the death of his daughter-in-law.

Stuart Schlesinger received a settlement award money two weeks after his disbarment from law practice. He never said he was disbarred or received our money. Stuart only used my wife and I as a means to get and steal our money.

I'm still having nightmares about this. How does a lawyer who takes an oath to protect his clients steal from them?

In early 2015 he met with my wife and I to give us a bouncing check in the amount of \$660,000. Both my wife and I were overwhelmed by his actions. We are in a state of limbo

and do not know what or how we will survive.

2 3

We were contacted by the FBI and told of his arrest for his criminal actions.

4

5

shame-faced only because he got caught. 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23 24

25

I will never forgive him, accept any apology, and I do not believe he is repentant for his actions. Stuart is

I ask this Court to make him pay us immediately in full and give him the maximum jail sentence under the law.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Last.

Would Sandi Bacon come forward.

MS. BACON: Hi, Stuart.

My name is Sandi Bacon, your Honor, pronounced "bacon."

I would like to thank the state's attorney, the FBI, and the victims coordinator for their compassion.

Never in my wildest dreams did I think I would be homeless at 72, but I am, because of the actions of Stuart Schlesinger. Not only did he steal my settlement money, he robbed me of my self-respect and dignity. And when the money ran out, I faced the eviction judge alone, on December 2, 2011.

That morning, at the courthouse, he had called in a "You have to fire me. I'm sending Michelle down. You need to sign some papers. It will go better for you without a lawyer. I'm not stealing your money. I'm not abandoning you."

I pleaded with the judge for my son's life: "Your Honor, it says 'In God We Trust' over your head. My son is so sick. We have no place to go. I'm afraid he's going to die." The judge laughed and said I deserved to be evicted because of the amount of my back rent and banged the gavel. I was to vacate my beautiful apartment in six days.

Several months later, in a failed suicide attempt, my son leapt from the third floor fire escape. Mercifully, an awning broke his fall, or Schlesinger would have taken my son from me as well.

On September 27, 2008, I was filming -- I'm a filmmaker -- at DUMBO Arts Street Festival, asking people who they thought won the first presidential election, or debate, when an SUV came out of nowhere and ran over my leg. After a painful operation and recovery, I was bedridden and unable to walk for a year, fell behind on my rent, and faced eviction. I heard that Stuart Schlesinger was "the guy" to get the big settlement, respected by the courts, and feared by insurance companies.

On April 4, 2011, he called me into his office. The case was settled and I was to pick up my check. He closed the door to the conference room and sat next to me. "I like you, I want to help, so I'm going to do something I would only do for family. But if anyone finds out, you'll be evicted immediately." He said because there was a lawsuit against the

city for neglecting to place barricades at the street festival, he would keep my settlement money, negotiate my back rent, quote, make it go away, so I could stay in my apartment, pay my rent going forward, and gave me money to live on.

A week later, on April 11, 2011, Allstate cut a check for \$100,000. He forged my name. I didn't receive my first check until -- for \$2300 until June 23, 2011. For nine months I begged every -- for every single check. In one instance he had me redeposit a check three times. They all bounced. There were also -- there were always excuses. He never gave me an accounting, after repeated requests. "It's Shabbos." "The bookkeeper is out." He told me he was negotiating with the judge over my -- he was negotiating with the judge over my back rent, but he found out -- but if he found out I received a settlement, he would evict me. And as the checks started bouncing, he'd scream at me on the phone, "I'll tell the judge. You'll have to move in 30 days. They'll evict you. I offered the judge \$10,000 for your back rent."

Court documents for the lawsuit against the city reveal Schlesinger never showed up to any of the hearings and the case was dismissed October of 2011. An NYPD officer testified it was the responsibility of the organizers of the DUMBO Arts Street Festival to make a formal request for the barricades, not the NYPD. So he sued the wrong people.

I kept begging him for the rest of the lump sum

because I was so broke, they shut my phone off. And my son was so sick, and we had no money to pay bills or eat. He wouldn't answer my calls. And then it happened — an eviction notice was placed on my door. It was the most humiliating thing that ever happened to me. I felt so much shame. Every day for weeks I called the marshal to see when the eviction was scheduled. And when it finally came, the marshal handed me my eviction papers and locked me out. As I rolled my last bag out of Peter Cooper, I was sobbing, humiliated. Homeless for the first time in my life. I had an illustrious 40-year career in advertising, and it had come to this.

I've tried to piece together from canceled checks and bounced checks but I'm still not sure. Suffice to say, it was a living hell for nine months. A few months after the eviction, I was to receive \$24,000 as a payout. I was a plaintiff in the Peter Cooper-Stuyvesant Town J-51 overcharging lawsuit. They kept the money for the back rent that Schlesinger was supposed to have negotiated. His abuse never ends.

I now live on \$24,888 a year -- my Social Security plus an odd job. I qualify for \$16 a month in food stamps because my Social Security check is too high. A couple of years ago I won the affordable housing lottery out of a hundred thousand applicants. I vetted for four months, and when I went to get my keys, I was denied because of the eviction -- the

eviction that never should have happened, were it not for Stuart Schlesinger. I also discovered I'm on a black list because if you've ever been evicted in housing court, you go on a black list, so I'll never get an apartment. So I sleep on Sheila's couch for five years, and if it wasn't for Sheila, I would be dead, I'm sure.

I am now homeless forever because of Stuart
Schlesinger's bottomless pit of greed and the pursuit of
things. A few months ago I saw a picture of his \$11.9 million
house in Quogue. Waterfront, heated swimming pool, eight
bedrooms, sauna, and tennis court. All those years of
suffering, the eviction, putting everything in storage, the
pain heaped on pain, betrayal and embarrassment, my son's
suffering, came flooding back like a tsunami. All this misery
for a beach house.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am.

Would Barbara Kaye come up and address the Court.

MS. KAYE: Barbara Kaye.

Very hard, your Honor, to stand here in court, in U.S. federal court, because Stuart Schlesinger, he broke the law. He knew the law. He was a lawyer for many, many years. But he chose to steal my money and everybody else's money, hoping he wouldn't be arrested.

When he -- when I received my confirmation letter from

the insurance company, the check was mailed to Julien & Schlesinger in 2014, I decided to contact Stuart Schlesinger during 2015. On several occasions, when I called his office, I was told he wasn't in the office. He was never in the office.

"He will call back." There are other times I called I was put on hold for several minutes. Probably he was telling them,

"Who is it?" And when he heard it was me, he didn't want to talk to me. And when he did call back, which was quite rare, I was told, "The computer crashed." "I'm not avoiding you."

"Give me more time." By now, I was convinced he was avoiding my phone calls.

The last two phone calls were quite interesting. I called. A female answered the phone. I asked to speak to Mr. Schlesinger. She said he wasn't in the office and she didn't know when he will be in. She took a message and rudely hung up. I didn't believe her, and I decided to call back.

And guess who answered the phone? Stuart Schlesinger picked up and said, "I'm not avoiding you. Give me more time. I will call you tomorrow." Which of course he never did. I called back the next day and told the girl he must call me back. He did three hours later and told me he would finish up my case and I'll get my money and he will call me back tomorrow. He never did.

It's sad to say, Stuart Schlesinger, you're a disgrace, and you have no morals. You could care less about us

victims, who went through so much.

And your Honor, I hope when you consider the sentence, you take into account what a terrible crime he committed against us.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Kaye.

Would Bill Landis come forward to address the court.

MR. LANDIS: Your Honor, I'd like to thank --

THE COURT: Just if you would be kind enough to state your name for the record.

MR. LANDIS: My name is Billy Ifure (ph) Landis.

I'd like to thank the FBI and the victims crime unit for all their help and compassion in dealing with this situation.

I hired the law firm of Julien & Schlesinger to represent me in a medical malpractice case. The matter was settled sometime in 2011, and almost immediately I grew suspicious with Stuart's daily stories. They never seemed to make much sense.

I asked him repeatedly, almost daily, for a expense breakdown related to the case. He would deny me that, even after I told him he was obligated by law to do so. He had all sorts of creative reasons why he couldn't provide the breakdown of the expenses: He was sick; his wife was sick; he even blamed at one point that the funds weren't being distributed

because his son Michael's wife passed away and he had to take care of funeral bills.

I grew more suspicious when he told me that the payments would be broken down over a period of time and that I'd be getting the checks in installments. I didn't understand what he was doing, and when I questioned him, he grew agitated and told me he was treating me like family.

At various times he gave me checks that either bounced, were issued from closed accounts, he once gave me a check with his name and his wife Linda's name on it, and most of these checks were never made good.

Then he had me meet him at his office and he wanted me to submit my monthly bills to him and his accountant. I don't recall her name. And he was supposed to be paying off these bills related to my estate. Needless to say, most of the time none of the checks that were supposed to be sent out ever arrived. And it did work for a brief period, but then after that, it just completely fell apart. It was a daily battle of hearing these excuses as to what happened to these funds and his various stories attempting to explain what he was doing, which didn't seem to make much sense.

The situation really got out of hand when he relocated from 1 Whitehall Street downtown to 307 East 94th Street.

The whole office just seemed to fall apart at the new location.

During this time Mr. Schlesinger would give me various checks

and he would tell me to hold them for two weeks, and that he was trying to make good on these various funds. He would chronically disappear for periods of time, and then you couldn't contact him. He would just vanish like a phantom.

I had a problem with my bank account, and the fraud division at Chase Manhattan told me that they suspected fraud. They contacted Stuart, and Stuart denied it to the end, even though, after the investigation from the bank, they told me that the checks were issued on a closed account. When the bank officer called Mr. Schlesinger, he still insisted that the checks were good, even though he knew the checks were bad.

The day before his arrest in Westhampton Beach, he called me several times on the phone and we got into a very heated exchange, at which time I called him a criminal, a thief, and a sociopath, among other things. I told him that he was being investigated for his crimes, and at that time the bar association had contacted me and told me that I was a victim of fraud and that they were looking into Mr.Schlesinger's very interesting accounting methods. They also contacted me and told me that they wanted me to fill out a complaint form, which I did, and that they were referring the matter over to the FBI. Soon thereafter, I was contacted by the FBI and I was told that I was the victim of fraud and that Mr. Schlesinger was arrested and that he was going to be hopefully prosecuted for his crimes.

I truly believe that Mr. Schlesinger has been doing this for years. This is not a one-shot deal. I think he's made this criminal behavior a way of life. I think he just got caught. I think he's the proverbial wolf in sheep's clothing. He likes to show himself off as like a grandfather figure, when he's sizing you up and targeting certain victims for him to take advantage of and for him to fleece them and rob them blind. I think it's despicable, I think he needs to be incarcerated for the longest period of time possible, and I think the strongest, harshest sentence should be imposed upon him for the crimes that he's committed against me and others.

Thank you, your Honor. Have a good day.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Landis.

Would Michael Kahani come forward to address the Court.

MR. KAHANI: My name is Michael Kahani.

Good afternoon, your Honor, and to the court. Thank you for allowing me to speak today.

My name is Michael Kahani. I'm a 29-year-old.

Several years ago, I suffered a terrible medical injury due to medical malpractice. To this day I have a brain injury, which affects all areas of my life. For example, I suffer from headaches, I have memory issues, I cannot continue my education because I cannot read for long periods of time and because I have such issues with memory, meaning that almost

everything I read, I forget. I have not been able to hold down a job for very long either.

I hired Stuart Schlesinger as a primary lawyer to sue the hospitals and the doctor who did this to me. Upon starting a lawsuit, a second group of lawyers was hired to help with the case.

What happened to me is that I had a severe headache for several days. When I came to the doctor, the neurologist, he did not follow up on the test results of finding blood in my brain. Instead he said it was due to anxiety. I even came back to him for a second MRI. The outcome was the same results as well, as was his response, anxiety.

Then I went to a hospital, same complaints, and the emergency room did not even check me completely. Through just looking at me, they concluded I looked good enough to leave. The doctor and persons at the hospital did not take me seriously and sent me home, which caused the sickness to get worse.

A few days later, I was taken to a different hospital because, from what I was told, I was not speaking normally. I did not know my name, where I was, or where I lived. It turned out I had a disease that is very rare. But had it been caught by the first hospital, I would not be this sick, I would not have almost died. Instead, I almost died.

At the second hospital, doctors told me I was one out

of 20 million that survived with the sickness. I woke up in the hospital, in my early 20s, forgetting how to speak English, couldn't see from one eye, and didn't know where I was, the day of the week, and the year. Although I was always reminded by the therapist every day.

I went from what to me was considered to be a normal human being to what to me is now abnormal, completely not normal. I've been fired from jobs since the sickness because I don't remember my job, what has to be done, or I don't understand the regulation and the rules. All of this is a result of the fact the first doctor didn't take me seriously when I came in.

The fact that I forget my schedule every day unless I write it down immediately, or on my phone, is the hardest I ever have to deal with, and in fact I cannot support myself. I have college loans which I haven't paid back. I forgot everything I ever learned in college which is as a result as well.

I trusted Mr. Schlesinger. I was told that he was a top attorney. The second group of lawyers that were hired was able to get the case settled with the doctor defendant. So I got called into the second lawyer's office and was told to sign an agreement that I would accept money as a settlement. But they told me that the only option I had was that Stuart Schlesinger will get the money, withdraw his third, and then

the remainder would be sent to me. But the money was never sent. Never. When I called Mr. Schlesinger, asking him when I would get the money, he kept saying over and over, he was getting it done. I have voicemail stored on my phone where he kept saying over and over, "I'm getting it done. I'm getting it done." But nothing ever came about. He never gave me my share.

So I'm the victim of both theft as well as lying. All this from a lawyer -- my lawyer. The money was supposed to help me after the doctor failed, maybe not to get back to normality but at least let me live just a little more comfortably. For god's sake, I use the handicapped MTA card all day because sometimes my inability to stand too much and I have my neurologist appointment as well as my psychiatrist as a result of the sickness on a weekly basis.

Mr. Schlesinger also failed me. I needed the money to live. I am still shocked Mr. Schlesinger had never -- had the nerve to steal everything. To me that isn't fair.

I need -- not want -- I need the money that was supposed to be given to me in settlement. I had trusted this man to help me, and instead he hurt me.

I ask the Court to do its honest best in punishing him as much as possible. I had to rely on him because of my medical condition, brain impairment. It's clear to me he took advantage of me and my medical condition.

Also, my wife and I are expecting another baby, and I can't even hold onto a job. It seems to be getting worse and worse every day. And this could have been made somewhat easier had he not lied to me and stolen from me what I deserved.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kahani.

Would Maria Pylarinos come forward to address the Court.

MS. PYLARINOS: Maria Pylarinos. A big problem from my hand. And my friend, he's give me --

THE COURT: Would you just pull the microphone a little closer.

There we go.

MS. PYLARINOS: Yes. So my friend, he's give me the best lawyer in the world. I trust. And everything, all my paper, I say, you have to sign it, because I can't sign very well. So I give me all my paper. I trust for everything.

The first one, he give me one check, the small check, and I go to the bank and I cash the small amount. Second time he say to me, I give me the check for next month. Next month, he say to me, I can't make it because I have to go someplace in the court. Come in next month. This is going all the way, all the time, all the time the same. And then after he say to me -- I say, careful for my Medicaid, Medicare, I have to pay everything because I don't want to cut because I'm no rich to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pay for the doctor if anything happened to me. He said, don't worry, I take care of all this kind of business for the Medicaid, Medicare. But then the Medicare, he called me up. He say, Maria, you have to pay my bill, my -- for the Medicare. I say, I mean, I no have money, and my lawyer, he's going to pay for you everything. And then he said to me, he said, Listen, it go into collection. Now if you no pay, I have to take your Social Security. I said, Listen, I have \$500 from the Social Security, and that -- that, I living for this money. And he send me the letters, and I take it to the lawyer. say to me, don't worry. I go to call for the lawyer for Medicaid and Medicare to make it very low, because it's very bad. After for that, every time he's give me the appointment to see in the office and I call up the -- the man that take care of the telephone, and he say to me, he's not here now because he's going to the court. And I call next day, he's not here now because he's going to the doctor. And I call him back again to give me all this, he say, I no now -- I no have time now to talk to you. I call you up. And that is go every month, every month, every month. And never he's call me up. And I -- my son's came and he want to talk. And he say, no, I no have time to talk to you. Don't worry. I take care of your mother because now is my best friend and my -- like my family, so I take care of everything. Never worry. And he give me check, and I go to the bank and then it's no good.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

take it back again, and he say, don't worry, give for you new And he give me new check and he say, don't -- don't going into the bank now. Go to the bank after couple of months because I have some big problem. And I wait and give me the date I'm going to the bank, and I'm going to the bank and the people is laughing at me, say, what is the check? It's no have money in the bank. And I take it back in, the check, and he grabbed it from my hand. He say, no, I'm going to give you another check for you. Make it after two months to cash the check. And I wait for the two months and I go back again to the bank, and say, no money in the bank. So -- and then after I in -- the collections is received for the Medicaid and Medicare, he send me in the second letters, and I give him, he say, no, don't worry. I take care of this. You no have to worry about it. Everything is going perfect. I call to the people, he say to me, I can't find this lawyer there. And all the time's going like this way.

And then my friend is show me in the computer the name and all the story. And then after — already, I can't believe it. I'm shocked. I can't believe it. This man, how he's talked to me so nice, so sweet, to happen like this way. And I — I can't make it anyhow.

I go to my friend, and my friend, he help me a lot.

And for FBI, thank you very, very much. Because he's very nice man, and he helped me.

For another lawyer, above all, this story. Already, I can't believe it. Like this way he's making to this old people to suffer for everything. And the lawyer, after he's — he's making the list, to be honest to everybody and not to happen like this.

I hope it's penalties so there's not another lawyer to make like this for the people.

Thank you very much, your Honor. My friend is talk to you.

No. Talk to him.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. COHEN: Hello. My name is Mark Cohen.

Just to expand on what Maria has shared, I think, you know, unfortunately, Maria is somebody who has to lead her family. She lives in a one-bedroom apartment with her husband and her daughter, doesn't really have a whole lot, and her case dragged on for five years.

I think she talked about a lot of the things that happened, but the one thing that we just wanted to address is that unfortunately, for the five years that this case went on, mysteriously, Maria never got any of the collection notices from Medicaid or Medicare, so once this whole thing started unraveling, while Mr. Schlesinger said that he was taking care of the medical bills, ultimately he wasn't, so Maria's case went into collections about three or four years ago.

After this happened, I started digging in, was on the phone with Medicare and Medicaid, on the phone with the U.S. Treasury, on the phone with the collection agencies.

Unfortunately, Maria had to pay the bill with money that she doesn't have, because ultimately the Treasury was going to garnish her Social Security. So, you know, he just put her through a really difficult time. That's super unfortunate.

Even though we've resolved the case with Medicaid and Medicare directly, we still get collection notices on probably a weekly basis. We got the last one a couple weeks ago. And for somebody in Maria's situation to be harassed on a weekly basis by a collections agency — we told them not to call, we told them to direct all communication to me, so now I get the letters. Even though we've told them it's been resolved, it still happens once, twice, three times a month.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Cohen.

Would Allison Gill come forward to address the Court.

MS. GILL: Good afternoon. My name is Allison Gill.

And I am an attorney employed by the New York City Department of Social Services, and I have been director of the Supplemental Needs Trust Program.

NYC DSS and, by extension, the state and federal government, the taxpayers, have been swindled out of a significant sum of money by Mr. Schlesinger. Supplemental

needs trusts are special trusts for severely disabled individuals that allow them to qualify for Medicaid while using their sheltered assets to enhance their quality of life. Upon the disabled individual's demise, the remaining funds in the trust are used to reimburse the Medicaid program for services provided.

Mr. Schlesinger established a supplemental needs trust for one of his malpractice clients, and after many years, it became time to wind down the trust and reimburse Medicaid.

Instead of depositing the real estate sales proceeds, earmarked for Medicaid reimbursement, into the SNT's bank account,

Mr. Schlesinger had the closing agent write the check to his law firm and deposit \$170,000 of those funds into his escrow account. Mr. Schlesinger promised payment to the department within 30 days. But then Mr. Schlesinger used his daughter-in-law's death as a delay tactic to hide the fact that he had stolen the \$170,000.

The \$170,000 that was pilfered from DSS in this case does not go into my pocket or in the mayor's pocket; it goes back to Medicaid recipients. All of the program's revenue is used to support the robust New York Medicaid program that guarantees needy New Yorkers adequate and affordable healthcare. Those funds could have helped an elderly person stay in their home with the help of a home health aide for the next six years, or help a person with a severe physical

disability attend an enriching day program for the next three years. But instead, those funds lined one person's pocket -- Mr. Schlesinger's.

The actions of Mr. Schlesinger are reprehensible and appalling. The money he purloined from the department would have made a significant impact in the lives of several Medicaid beneficiaries. He should not be given a mere slap on the wrist. This was not a mistake. This was a calculated effort.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Gill.

Is there any other victim present in the courtroom who wishes to come forward and address the Court?

All right. Seeing none -- is there someone?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes, there is.

MR. LAWLER: Hello there. My name is Kenneth Lawler. I'm from the United Kingdom.

I employed Julien & Schlesinger when my son passed away in 2009, so this was probably one of the lowest ebbs of my life. So I wanted to employ someone with a reasonable reputation who was going to basically do a good job for me over here in the United States. But I haven't got any idea of how the systems worked, so I had to put all my efforts -- well, all my trust in a solicitor, or an attorney, in America.

And like everybody who spoke before me, getting the actual money from the insurance people through a claim went

through quite quickly, and everything seemed to be okay. But when we were hoping to get the money then simply from the -from them to our accounts, then it all started going wrong, and
from -- from January in 2013 to the present day, we've
constantly been asking them, how is -- where is the money?
What do we need to do next? How's things going?

And the difficulty with being over in the United Kingdom is trying to keep in touch with these people, and when you can't find them on the phone and you can't get in touch and it's costing more and more money — so we would sometime get through with emails and things like that to contact him. But when we do — did get in contact with him, he'd be trying to quickly take me off the subject of the case and it would be down to personal matters. And even on one occasion he said to me that, "Don't worry. I'll — I can deliver the check personally and we can have a game of golf over in the UK."

So when I was getting comments like that, I was beginning to think, this is a bit strange. And even though — there was times where I would bring it up, and he would say, "Don't worry. The — your money is safe." And being from where I come from, when someone starts saying things like that, I suddenly start thinking, something's wrong here. Why would he say my money's safe when I haven't asked if it's safe? But we kept going and pushing along, and over the years, he kept going with the same excuses like everybody else has been

giving. Now I feel a bit of a -- sort of -- what I've been hearing from these stories here -- My son has passed away, and I haven't been able to finish his estate now since 2009 till now. I'm still waiting to complete his estate. And every time I have to return to this matter, it brings back all the sad memories. So that was one reason I didn't want to talk. But now I'm just waiting.

We were pushing him along and pushing him along, and even up until he was arrested by the FBI, we were even trying to get him to sort of sort out bonds and things like that, you know, to try to get something out. We were afraid if we lost contact, we would lose everything completely. But --

So that's it, really. We've just been going on for years and years and years with the same excuses that everybody else has been giving. And at a time when I was at my lowest ebb. I lost my son and shortly after my wife, who died of cancer. So the two combined were causing me a lot of distress. And so it was difficult to -- for me personally to talk to him at times. So I managed to -- me son, me other son, started to do some of the contacting, because I just couldn't at times talk, talk to the guy, 'cause I would be wanting to do something that probably we shouldn't be allowed to do.

So that's my story, basically. And thank you for letting me speak.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Lawler.

Is there any other victim present in the courtroom who wishes to address the Court?

All right. At this time I will hear from counsel.

Mr. Richman, do you wish to be heard on behalf of Mr. Schlesinger?

MR. RICHMAN: Respectfully, your Honor.

Your Honor, I have been practicing law 52 years. I've never heard a series of stories such as this. I'm touched.

And what can be said? There's no justification, none
whatsoever, for actions such as this by my client. And I make no excuses for it. And to the extent that I'm responsible as a lawyer, as a lawyer, who apologizes to each and every one of the victims on my behalf as a lawyer, and on behalf of my client, I'm sorry for you. I am.

I'm troubled by all this. I'm troubled by the pain he's caused these people, and believe it or not, prior to becoming an attorney, I have a degree in social work and worked as a social worker. I see people and I see the trouble they have. And what my client has done is just reprehensible.

I'm also angry what he's done to the legal community.

I'm angry in the sense that he has made every lawyer's word

less meaningful. And we have a bad enough reputation as

lawyers. And to have this to be brought to the attention of

the community and the world at large doesn't help us. But it

should be a lesson brought to every young lawyer who becomes an

attorney to see what can happen.

Interestingly enough, I've known Stuart Schlesinger for almost 50 years. And it's something — how do you balance these things? How do you? You've seen the letters we've submitted to you from people who love him and trusted him, and, you know, how do you justify it? The letters and the things he's done, some wonderful things he's done, and yet the horror that he's caused as well. I guess it's true that we're made up of so many different factors in our lives, with just so many different complex aspects. We're like facets of a diamond, some good, some bad, some glittering, some not so glittering.

I don't know what caused this. I cannot even excuse his conduct. I know that the psychiatric report indicates some cognitive impairment and his other problems that he's had.

Doesn't justify what he did. And I'm thinking of a thing my mother used to tell me that no matter how good the milk you get from the cow and all the good the cow gives you, in one kick, the cow knocks over the pail and all the good milk is spilled. And this is what has happened here.

It's easy for people to wish him all the evil in the world, and I can understand how they feel. That's the tough part of being a judge. I'm not trying to tell you what to do. You know better than anybody else. You've got to balance the various equities.

I submitted a memorandum to you, extensive memorandum,

as to his background, his family life. The person that was portrayed by these victims is not the same person I know, and I cannot understand it. And I'm standing here before you and almost finding myself repeating it over and over. How did it become this way? How did it get this way? And --

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Through greed. Greed. He knows what he was doing. He was taking victim's money.

THE COURT: Please. Silence in the gallery.

MR. RICHMAN: Respectfully, your Honor, I understand how the people feel. To them there's no punishment big enough. But you're going to have to frame something palatable, something manageable, something in reality. He's 76 years old. And if you want to sentence him to death, you can. And that's essentially what I'm sure many of these people — and I understand it. And there's not a bad person in this crowd. But I can understand how they might even wish for that. But that would be a wrong wish. It wouldn't be a justifiable wish. It wouldn't be justice. It wouldn't be what the system is all about. It would be the wrong thing.

He's done a lot of good in his life; an awful lot of good. And you've seen the letters from the people indicating the extent of the decent, wonderful things he did, helping people and doing good things.

Why he got this way, whether he was trying to save a failing practice by using other people's money, it is certainly

not justified, if that was done. It was just -- it was wrong. No justification about that.

This is a man who's got -- his wife has problems, he's got problems. But everybody has problems. Everybody has pain. Everybody has difficulties. Placed in a position of having access to money, he took advantage of that position. I cannot justify it. I will only ask that your Honor, in structuring a sentence herein, structure it with the concept of taking a factor into consideration, his age, and under 3553(a), his medical, health, and psychological conditions, and fashion a sentence that is appropriate under the circumstances.

I thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Richman, before you sit down -- MR. RICHMAN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: -- since the summer of 2014, when litigation started to be commenced against Mr. Schlesinger and then grievance proceedings started and ultimately a criminal investigation, what has Mr. Schlesinger done to pay restitution to any of his victims?

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, we have put everything up for sale and the monies will be -- we had tried to make arrangements with the U.S. Attorney's Office to arrange that all the monies, whatever we get from the sale, from the sale of the house, from the sale of his personal properties, they're all in an auction house to be turned over to the victims, every

1 single penny. 2 THE COURT: How long has the house been for sale? 3 MR. RICHMAN: A year and a half, sir. It's been 4 listed and it's been shown, hundreds of times. 5 THE COURT: But not one single offer, right? 6 MR. RICHMAN: I don't know the economy. One of the 7 good things is, I'm not a real estate lawyer, but apparently no offers. 8 9 THE COURT: Did Mr. Schlesinger and his wife give 10 three mortgages on their Dune Road property in August of 2014? 11 MR. RICHMAN: I do not have knowledge of that, sir. 12 THE COURT: Well, a lawyer by the name of Kriss 13 submitted a letter to the Court. You wrote in response to that 14 letter and took exception to certain statements that Mr. Kriss 15 made. But I'd like to know from your client whether in fact he and his wife received approximately \$2.3 million in August of 16 17 2014 from Sheldon Solow and Steven Cherniak (ph). 18 Would you consult with him.

MR. RICHMAN: I will.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Mr. Richman consulting with the defendant)

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, apparently Mr. Solow was -my client was indebted to Mr. Solow and he gave a mortgage to
Mr. Solow to protect the debt that he owed Mr. Solow. There
was no money received during 2014.

THE COURT: You know, the probation department pressed

your client twice to provide financial information, and last week, when I got the presentence report and saw that probation was reporting that he had not given a financial statement, I directed that a statement be submitted, and a statement ultimately was submitted lacking in documentation. But nowhere in that statement does Mr. Schlesinger reveal that he gave mortgages to Sheldon Solow, two mortgages to Sheldon Solow, for a total of 2.2 million, and another mortgage for 75,000 to someone named Steven Cherniak, whoever that is. And by the way, I'd like to know who that is. And while you're conferring with him, I'd like to know why he failed to disclose on a financial statement, under oath, mortgages totaling 2.3 million, from which one could conclude that he received 2.3 million in about August of 2014.

(Mr. Richman conferring with the defendant)

MR. RICHMAN: I'm informed, your Honor, most respectfully, that the 75 was to Steven Cherniak, who is another person he owed money to, who put a mortgage on, and my client claims that he did not -- sorry -- put a lien on as opposed to a mortgage at that particular point.

THE COURT: Well, that's not what Mr. Kriss writes. But your client and his wife gave mortgages to Sheldon Solow, right?

MR. RICHMAN: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So whatever equity was in the house they

stripped out of the house in August of 2014 when they knew the 1 world was coming down around them, right? 2 3 MR. RICHMAN: I think my client can address that 4 situation himself, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: He'd better. 6 MR. RICHMAN: Do you want to address that? 7 THE COURT: No. MR. RICHMAN: Yes, your Honor. I'm sorry. I will 8 9 proceed. 10 THE COURT: I want to know why he didn't disclose 11 these mortgages. That in itself is a federal crime, for which 12 maybe the U.S. Attorney's Office should prosecute him. 13 (Defendant conferring with Mr. Richman) 14 MR. RICHMAN: I'm informed, your Honor, that this is a mortgage that was given prior to August '14. It was recorded 15 August '14. This was in lieu of an existing, outstanding 16 17 obligation. That's the best of my knowledge. At that particular point. 18 19 THE COURT: That excuses him from disclosing it on his 20 declaration of net worth? 21 MR. RICHMAN: It does not, your Honor. Obviously not. 22 THE COURT: So back to my question: Why did he 23 conceal it? 24 (Mr. Richman conferring with the defendant) 25 MR. RICHMAN: He insists that he did not knowingly or

wilfully attempt to conceal it.

THE COURT: You know, my problem is that two mortgages totaling 2.2 million, held by Sheldon Solow, given by Mr. Schlesinger and his wife, lead me, without further information, to believe that Mr. Schlesinger has \$2.2 million sitting somewhere.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's right.

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Well, it's a fair conclusion for the Court, especially when he withholds financial statements and then doesn't disclose it, when we finally pry one from him.

MR. RICHMAN: It's a reasonable inference, your Honor.

I agree. I'm not suggesting otherwise.

THE COURT: So I'm concerned about flight.

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, for the moment, sir, my client has his entire life here. There's never been the possibility and even a suggestion of flight. Never in this entire proceedings. And I recognize that — we've discussed this matter. My client recognizes that he's going to jail. We recognize the extent to which he's going to jail. At 76, whatever the sentence could be, could be the end of his life, and he knows that. And he showed up for sentence, and he made no effort to avoid sentence. And, you know, with all due respect —

THE COURT: He doesn't know what he's going to get at

the moment, and every person lives in hope, and maybe he's got \$2.2 million sitting someplace.

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, there is no possibility. Frankly speaking, sir, I don't believe that's a reality at all. And I understand why you may believe that. We have tried to address Mr. Kriss's letter on that issue.

THE COURT: No. You didn't address it on that issue.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, I've spoken to the --

THE COURT: The mortgages are there as clear as could be. A third mortgage to Steven Cherniak for 75,000, dated August 8, 2014, and recorded March 13, 2015; a fourth open mortgage with Sheldon Solow in the amount of 400,000, dated August 8, 2014, and recorded April 3, 2015; and a fifth open mortgage with Sheldon Solow in the amount of \$1,866,285, dated August 1, 2014, and recorded April 3, 2015. Who records all these kinds of mortgages in April, but they were all given in August by Mr. and Mrs. Schlesinger.

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, may I respectfully point out, when we received that letter -- and we just received that letter this past week -- we called the U.S. Attorney's Office, we wanted to address that issue quite strongly, and the U.S. Attorney and I came to the conclusion that the information therein was not entirely accurate. We did not have the chance to investigate further.

THE COURT: These were recorded in liber books in the

Suffolk County Clerk's Office.

(Mr. Richman conferring with the defendant)

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, it's my understanding -- and to the extent if we have to go further and do a little investigation of this, we received -- I understand the U.S. Attorney's Office received this letter or a similar letter sometime earlier this summer. We received a copy of this letter just -- we received this letter this past week on this particular information. I never received information back then to go and investigate that particular aspect of the claim. When I called the U.S. Attorney's Office on this particular issue, I said to Mr. Laroche, Is this an issue? Is there a problem we have to deal with on this issue? And I said, If necessary, and he said to me, Murray, there is not. We don't necessarily accept everything Mr. Kriss is saying. And that's the extent to which we had gone through this issue.

I am caught at a disadvantage on this particular issue at this particular juncture, sir, and I wouldn't be here addressing the issue like this if I were not.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Laroche, do you want to weigh in on this?

MR. LAROCHE: Yes, your Honor.

I disagree with Mr. Richman in regards to our conversation about the specific letter. I think our conversation was more to the effect of whether Mr. Kriss would

be speaking about the specific issues raised in this letter. I think the government's preference is that it would be limited to victims, the reason being because the issues that surround forfeiture and restitution are ongoing, in the government's view, in terms of how the government is going to seek to satisfy forfeiture and restitution and —

THE COURT: Right. But the government expressed in

THE COURT: Right. But the government expressed in its letter a concern about whether there was much, if any, equity in the Dune Road home. So I presume the government's done a title search and that this information is accurate.

MR. LAROCHE: That's correct, your Honor. The information is accurate, which is why we said in our sentencing submission we have serious concerns that there is any value at all in the home. So that's an issue that the government --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LAROCHE: I don't know if the Court would like to hear from the government at this point.

THE COURT: I do want to.

Mr. Richman, are you finished?

MR. RICHMAN: I hate to finish on that note, your Honor, most respectfully. As an attorney and as an advocate, I'm placed at a terrible disadvantage under the circumstances.

Your Honor --

THE COURT: I got the letter the same time you did. Okav?

MR. RICHMAN: Well, apparently --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And it piqued my curiosity. Especially the timing. It's so exquisite.

(Defendant conferring with Mr. Richman)

THE COURT: Mr. Schlesinger will get a chance to address the Court after the government has spoken.

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, if it is a concern from the point of view of Mr. Schlesinger's failure to -- or thinking of leaving the jurisdiction, I don't believe that's a reality, based upon the fact that he surrendered his documents and his passport, he's been here at each and every one of the proceedings. He's not young. He's not well. He's going nowhere. And that could be reasonably concluded. I recognize the extent of his punishment, and believe me, I've made it quite clear to him, long ago, hope or no hope, that he was going to jail on this case for a substantial period of time. made that clear to him virtually the first day we got involved in this case. And when we decided to take a plea early on in this matter, there was clarity, sheer clarity, that we knew that jail was a reality. Had there been a desire to abscond, to leave the jurisdiction, it would have been taken advantage of under the circumstances before we got to this juncture. think reasonably, you must conclude that also. It's not absolute, but I can assure you that, you know, in all the time I've practiced, I've yet to lose a client, ever, and I've had

some interesting clients. I don't believe it's going to occur here, for whatever value you give to my word on this issue.

THE COURT: The bond is essentially worthless, right?

MR. RICHMAN: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. RICHMAN: I don't believe so.

THE COURT: The government thinks so.

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, it appears the persons who have signed it are in addition to the bond. It's not just the property itself. It's the people who have signed it. And the value of a bond is the word more than anything else. The property securing it is almost secondary, second nature.

I submit to you that I understand the desire to punish the man under the circumstances, but is he any different than any other person you may have sentenced to more serious crimes and permitted him to continue? You know, there's a desire to placate, but it's not a proper thing to do under the circumstances. I can't advocate to you what you have to do, but there's a balance that you have to strike, and it's not an easy balance to make. And I urge your Honor — I know the persons here would cheer if your Honor would take certain action, and your Honor will be sentencing him severely to that kind of action, but let's not throw the baby out with the bath water. We have a balancing act here, and a difficult one to make.

Thank you, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Richman.

Mr. Laroche, does the government want to be heard?

MR. LAROCHE: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't you take the podium.

MR. LAROCHE: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, over the course of eight years, the defendant stole millions of dollars from two dozen victims, at least. Those he victimized were already suffering, as we heard, from life-altering injuries. Some were suffering from the death of loved ones. The defendant didn't care. He stole their money and lied to them. He left them revictimized and broken. And he did all this not because he himself was in financial destitution. The defendant, rather, committed his crimes from the comfort of his million-dollar home in Quogue and from his law office in Manhattan.

By any measure, the defendant's crimes were despicable, but the fact that he committed his crimes using his law degree makes them especially disgraceful.

As the Court is aware, the government is seeking a guidelines sentence in this case. That's a sentence within 78 to 87 months' imprisonment. We believe that all of the factors the Court should consider in determining an appropriate sentence counsel in favor of a guidelines sentence, and the government talks about each of those factors in depth in their

sentencing submission. They include the nature of the offense, the history and characteristics of the defendant, the need for deterrence, the need for restitution, the nature of the offense.

To begin with, I'm not going to be able to describe the offense any better than the victims have here today. I would just note that this offense was extremely serious, long running, and devastating to the victims, and each of them I think have given very powerful statements about how it has impacted them.

As to the history and characteristics of the defendant, I would take issue — and I understand Mr. Richman is doing the best he can with what he has. That said, I take issue with the idea that this was a one-time lapse of judgment or mistake that erased a lot of years of good work. This was eight years of blatantly lying to victims, repeatedly. It showed a lack of respect for the law, for basic ethical norms, and for the property of others. And the defendant was doing this not because he needed to. He could make legitimate work. He'd been a lawyer since I think 1965, with a very successful practice. He simply did not need to lie and steal from the victims the way he did. And the only reason that he stopped this was because he got caught. It was because the victims complained and people began investigating. So the history and characteristics of the defendant, in the government's view,

support a guidelines sentence.

We also believe a guidelines sentence affords adequate deterrence here. This is a highly publicized case, for obvious reasons, both just generally in the public and in the legal profession. I think a guidelines sentence, a substantial sentence, would send a strong message to the legal profession about what the consequences are for this type of abhorrent behavior, about what can happen to you if you decide to steal money from your clients for a period of years. The defendant's conduct has broken the trust of each of the victims here as to the legal profession, and we think that serves as a significant basis for a guidelines sentence.

On the need for restitution, your Honor, I think what I will say is the government is doing, and will continue to do, everything we can to find assets that can be forfeited, to whatever extent possible, to provide restitution to the victims. The government has serious concerns for many of the reasons that the Court has identified earlier, when Mr. Richman was speaking, about, among other things, how forthcoming the defendant has been with respect to his finances, whether that particular property is going to have any value whatsoever. We understand that there are a number of significant mortgages standing against that property, and the government's concerned that he will have the funds to do so. That said, there are clearly assets. He's reported some assets here, whether it be

art or antiques. It's something. But it's extremely disappointing to see the way the financial disclosures were made in this case in the PSR, and the government has great concerns about it, and the government is not ending its investigation, in terms of how it's going to look at forfeiture when this forfeiture order is entered today. The government is going to keep investigating those specific issues so that we can seek as much compensation for the victims as possible within our power.

I'd also note that it's also troubling that the law firm itself had a number of cases -- and I think Mr. Kriss references this in his letter -- that were apparently transferred to another law firm. It's very difficult -- and again, this gets back to what the government is still considering, but it's very difficult to place a value on those cases and identify them as assets that can be forfeited. But again, it's another aspect of the forfeiture that the government is continuing to investigate and I think is important to consider.

Mr. Richman -- and I understand he's making the best argument he can for his client. He submitted a number of letters from friends and family, which no doubt are heartfelt and sincere. But those letters are not a reason for leniency. In fact, I think those letters should give the Court even more pause. I think the reason they should is because those letters

show that the defendant had the support of numerous people, including his close family and friends. He had no reason to do this. And the only reason that the government can come up with for why he did this was greed. He could have at any point along the way sold his assets, gotten rid of them, paid the people that needed to be paid. Instead he left them broken and revictimized.

And the government believes that for all those reasons, he deserves a significant sentence in this case, and a sentence within the guidelines range is appropriate.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Laroche.

Mr. Richman, does your client want to address the Court before sentence is imposed?

MR. RICHMAN: May I just speak with my client for one moment, sir?

THE COURT: Certainly.

(Mr. Richman conferring with the defendant)

MR. RICHMAN: Respectfully, my client wishes to address the Court.

THE COURT: Very well. I will hear from Mr. Schlesinger now. He can take the podium.

THE DEFENDANT: Before I talk about the clients, I'd respectfully like to address your Honor's question about the mortgage.

Mr. Solow loaned me money over many years -- I don't

recall how many years -- in different increments. And I even executed whatever his counsel asked me to execute to protect the loans. The mortgage that was executed that -- or two mortgages that you referred to that was recorded, were being held way before they were recorded. I had no idea they were recording it. As a matter of fact, the letter that your Honor refers to by Mr. Kriss, we never saw. He wrote a letter to your Honor and to counsel, to the U.S. Attorney, in July. We never saw it. We were never given it. Had I seen it, it would have certainly been a bell ringing that there was mortgages. I searched everything. The government took every single box from our office --

THE COURT: Do you realize what you're telling me?

That, in essence, it was more important to you to secure a loan that a billionaire friend had given you over the course of years than it was to pay back any of the clients who are your victims? Do you understand that's what you're telling me?

THE DEFENDANT: That's not what I'm saying, respectfully.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's what I'm reading from that, Mr. Schlesinger.

THE DEFENDANT: The money I received from him goes back over maybe ten years.

THE COURT: Like I said, you thought it more important to see that a friend who loaned you money over the years was

secured than that the government or any victim could recover money you stole from them.

THE DEFENDANT: That mortgage was given way before any of this took place, your Honor. That mortgage was given -
THE COURT: It's dated August 8, 2014. You and your

wife signed it on August 8 of 2014.

THE DEFENDANT: I have to --

THE COURT: I think you should move on to something else because you're not persuading me.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you very much.

THE DEFENDANT: I -- I came here also today to address the victims. And after hearing -- to tell them how I feel and the regrets. I'm going to do that, and then I was going to address the Court, but I'd rather address the Court first on other issues.

THE COURT: Fine.

THE DEFENDANT: I know what I did, I know the extent of what I did, and I know how terrible it is. I listened to Mr. Richman, and he couldn't -- he said it the way it was. I didn't do it -- I -- whatever thought process was going through my mind, it was -- at the time it was all being done, I was doing it to save and try to save what I had in terms of the firm and everything else. There was no reason to do it. It shouldn't have been done.

I -- through your Honor, I tell the judiciary, who

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I've been before many courts over the last 50 years, how profoundly sorry I am. I certainly know that I'm atypical to the legal profession. This is not something lawyers do, and I've insulted the legal profession, but it's atypical. This is not typical of the legal profession.

I don't have -- just to -- I didn't do anything intentionally in that statement that your Honor referred to. In fact, just to put a period to it, if I may, there were boxes and boxes of documents taken from my office that I had to go through for weeks and weeks in order to put that statement together, and it was painstaking. Little pieces of So I finally got together a cohesive statement. I'm sure -- I'm sure that when the house is sold, Sheldon Solow is not going to press his mortgage. I'm sure when the house is sold, that Sheldon Solow is not going to press his mortgage. And the equity in that house from my equity is there for restitution. That house will be sold. It's a good equity. It's a good solid piece of property. And it will be sold. Yes, it's been on the market for a considerable period of time, but every effort is being made to sell it, every advertisement -- and it will be. There have been some not-in-writing offers that were low end. We expect to get better, and we expect it to be sold. And the only mortgages that are outstanding are -- the ones that will be pressed are the ones that I put in the statement, the 5 million mortgage to

HSBC. I can't -- of course I can't quarrel or take issue with what your Honor says about that it wasn't in the statement, but I'm at loss, and I would have, but that money, again -- I'll leave the issue alone.

THE COURT: Fine.

THE DEFENDANT: I've lost everything that I've earned in 50 years. I lost my license, I lost my respect, I have terrible issues with family, and I've been punished beyond, beyond -- what I deserve, but beyond what I could even handle anymore.

To the people, I know I'm here today to be punished for the horror that I committed. I'm not going to ask for forgiveness. I heard what they said. I can't ask for forgiveness. I took a positive with each and every one of them and turned it into a horrible negative. It started off as a positive and turned it into a horrible negative. So there's no way that I could ask their forgiveness. They didn't deserve what I did. Trying to say to them, to each and every one of them, that I'm sorry, but I know the words won't be heard or won't be accepted, but that's how I really feel. I do feel the remorse. I do know I have the guilt. I feel the guilt. I am terribly ashamed for what I did to each and every one of them. There's no question about that.

Mrs. Last, I know the fears and the anger that I caused her. I lived through it. I know it. I know each

minute that she suffers. So to say I'm sorry and I'm ashamed is not going to impact on them, but I am.

To Billy, to Mr. Landis --

MR. LANDIS: You've got to be kidding me. You've got to be kidding me. Don't you dare. You're making a mockery of this court system with your lies.

THE COURT: Mr. Landis, please.

MR. LANDIS: I can't take it anymore.

THE COURT: Be seated.

MR. LANDIS: How dare he.

THE DEFENDANT: I know that my terrible misdeeds, my conduct to him, put him in a terrible place.

Mr. Lawler, I know what he went through. I know everything. I know all of this. I've heard.

MR. LANDIS: Then why did you do it? Why did you do it?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Through greed.

THE DEFENDANT: I came here to say I'm sorry. I came here to put all the shame and all the guilt to these people for what I did to them. I can't turn back the clock with them.

But I do know, your Honor, that every effort on restitution to either the lawyers fund, if they make restitution to them, from my assets, will be done. The cases that counsel -- may I, your Honor. I'm sorry. The cases -- the cases that counsel, we -- we submitted a list of cases to counsel, to U.S. Attorney's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There is tremendous equity in those cases. Mr. Richman represented to your Honor in a presentation -- and parenthetically, or -- Mr. Kriss refers to fees and makes -every single fee that I will get or Julien & Schlesinger will get must -- must be approved by the court and the manner of payment, and we submitted the two that have been resolved already to your Honor. The two orders -- two Supreme Court judges did that, contrary to what Mr. Kriss says. We, in one -- in fact, in one of them, the court said, pay this money to the lawyers fund. The lawyers fund wrote back and said, we got it, and we're going to use it and apply it when we make restitution to the clients, to the victims. There are 50 some odd -- 40, 50 some odd cases like that. Every fee that will be realized from those cases we represented, we would ask the Supreme Court judge who fixes the fee, which they have to do by the rules and the law, because I'm a disbarred lawyer, will fix the fee and put the manner of payment down for the lawyers fund, in the hope that in the interim, the lawyers fund will make restitution, will pay the clients, the victims. What your Honor said about the -- I don't have any

What your Honor said about the -- I don't have any money, your Honor. I don't -- what you claim that that money -- it doesn't exist. It was money from years and years and years. I understand your position, what you say about the mortgage. And quite frankly, it would have been -- it's -- I know what Mr. Solow is going to do, and I didn't know that it

was recorded, but I know what he's going to do. He's not going to press that. Whatever we realize in profit, whatever we realize from the equity will be paid, to the lawyers fund, or to whoever the U.S. Attorney wants it to be paid.

I struggle -- I came here thinking that I would face the people and do my apology and knowing that it's not the kind of thing that they want to hear, but I don't know how to express the sincerity that's in me about what I did. I know what I did that was terrible, I know what I did was a crime, I know that I shouldn't have done it, I know -- I was struggling to try to balance things in the firm. I should have taken different actions. It's -- I sit here now saying, why didn't I do it? I've sought all kinds of help to try to figure it out.

What Murray -- sorry. When Murray said to me in the -- when Mr. Richman said to me, you're going to die in jail --

I want to make restitution. I want to be -- I want to do everything that I can. These are good things, good assets, good things that can be done. I don't want to die in jail.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You will.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry, your Honor. Let me sit down.

THE COURT: You may be seated.

THE DEFENDANT: Can I just --

THE COURT: Yes, sure.

MR. RICHMAN: Sit down.

THE COURT: The defendant, Stuart Schlesinger, comes before this Court having pled guilty to wire fraud, a serious crime against the United States.

This Court has reviewed the presentence report and adopts the findings of fact in that report as its own. I'll cause that report to be docketed and filed under seal as part of the record in this case.

I've also reviewed all of the submissions of the parties and numerous victim statements and listened to statements by victims here today and the arguments of counsel, and the defendant's remarks to the Court.

Turning first to the guidelines calculation, which, as the Supreme Court stated in *Gall v. United States*, should be the starting point and the initial benchmark to determine a sentence. This crime sounds in fraud, and so the base offense level is 7. Because the offense here resulted in a loss of at least \$5.5 million, an increase of 18 levels is warranted. Because there are more than 10 victims, an additional two-level enhancement is appropriate. Further, because Mr. Schlesinger certainly knew that his victims were fragile and therefore susceptible to his misconduct, a two-level increase is warranted under Section 3A1.1(b)(1). Moreover, because he abused a position of trust and used his status as a lawyer to facilitate and conceal his conduct, an additional two-level

enhancement is entirely appropriate.

Now Mr. Schlesinger pled guilty before this Court, and accordingly, under the guidelines, he's entitled to a three-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility.

And so his total offense level is 28.

He has no prior criminal convictions, so his criminal history category is I.

And that yields a guideline range of 78 to 87 months of imprisonment.

Now turning to the 3553(a) factors, Mr. Schlesinger is 76 years old and in relatively good health. As a consequence of the criminal activity that he engaged in, he's been disbarred. For nearly a half century, Mr. Schlesinger was a prominent lawyer at the apex of the personal injury bar in New York. Undoubtedly, over the course of his illustrious career, he helped many people who became his clients.

His friends and colleagues also speak in their letters of his generosity and kindness, and there's no doubt that he did good works and helped people in all walks of life.

But this case reveals that under the veneer of an accomplished and highly respected attorney, Mr. Schlesinger was really a predator. His conduct was long running and devastating to the individuals he victimized. There were years and years of deceit and deception to carry out his scheme. He had to lie every day to clients on the telephone, in emails,

and by faxes. His conduct was reprehensible.

Now he earned millions and millions of dollars as a contingency lawyer and also amassed a fortune in real estate, but apparently it wasn't enough. Ten years ago, he sold an elegant brownstone on East $64^{\rm th}$ Street, just a few feet from Central Park, for more than \$21 million.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Wow.

THE COURT: And back in 1981, he purchased the Dune Road property in Quogue that's now appraised for more than 11 million.

His conduct in this case demonstrates a lack of respect for the law, a profession that gave him and his family so much over half a century. And as the government points out, his crime was not a momentary lapse. It was a calculated scheme over a period of at least eight years, that he could have stopped at any time if he chose to.

The need for general deterrence here is obvious. The enormity of Mr. Schlesinger's criminal conduct has understandably captured the attention of the public and the legal profession. All lawyers need to understand the special position they hold in our society and the privileges that a license to practice law confers. And those ill-intentioned attorneys who might be tempted to steal from their clients need to be deterred.

Specific deterrence is also important here because of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the brazenness and audacity of Mr. Schlesinger's scheme. He converted his law license to a license to steal. It's really hard to pinpoint exactly when Mr. Schlesinger started stealing from his clients, but once he started, he didn't stop. And the sad thing is that he could have stopped at any moment.

He abused his fiduciary position as an attorney to help himself to the monies that belonged to his clients, who thought they were receiving compensation for the serious injuries, or deaths, that they and their families had suffered. And even after a client sued him and the handwriting was on the wall, he didn't try to make things right. Indeed, as I've discussed in colloquy today with the parties, it appears to this Court that, with disciplinary proceedings and lawsuits under way against him, he instead orchestrated a scheme to suck every penny of equity out of his beachfront estate on Dune Road. He gave two mortgages to his billionaire friend, and now, for the last year and a half, with his wife as the listing real estate agent for the property, they've offered it for sale -- of course at a price so high, no purchaser ever even made a serious offer. How convenient for Mr. Schlesinger. just spent another summer in the Hamptons. Mrs. Schlesinger, by the way, is the listing agent on the property and may be eligible to receive a real estate commission from any sale. Ι take the government at its word that it's concerned whether the property will yield any relief for the victims.

And after Mr. Schlesinger pled guilty, he's apparently been busy selling personal property, including artworks.

Indeed, between May 24 and July 15, after selling several artworks, he deposited more than \$65,000 into his wife's account. And probation reports that "the bank statements reflect other significant deposits for which the sources of the deposits are unknown." So it really seems, Mr. Schlesinger, that the fraudulent conduct continues. I'm troubled by a pattern of trying to obfuscate the true state of your financial affairs.

As for restitution, the possibility that your victims will ever be made whole is remote. It will be up to other lawyers, the client security fund, and the U.S. Attorney's Office, to pursue your assets, including mortgage proceeds, if there is 2.2 million out there, antiques, artwork, attorney's fees that your former firm may still be entitled to on pending matters, and who knows what else.

It's a very sad day for everyone in the courtroom.

Mr. Schlesinger had a distinguished career, but he ends it in complete disgrace, disbarment, and prison.

The scheme went on far too long, and it's well beyond the time when Mr. Schlesinger should be called to account. His conduct was outrageous and showed a complete lack of respect for the law, ethical norms, and his vulnerable clients.

And so it's against that backdrop that I'm prepared to

impose sentence at this time, and I'd ask, Mr. Schlesinger, that you stand.

Mr. Schlesinger, in my remarks I have tried to convey my profound disappointment in someone of your stature who has fallen so far. You're really just a thief. And you can't be honest. You can't make an honest disclosure.

It is my judgment that you be sentenced to a term of 78 months of imprisonment, to be followed by three years of supervised release, subject to all the standard conditions of supervised release and the following special conditions:

First, that you provide your probation officer with access to any requested financial information;

That you not incur any new credit card charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of your probation officer, unless you're in compliance with your installment payment schedule that I'm going to fix for restitution.

I'm not going to impose any fine on you because that would be an exercise in futility.

But I am going to sign the order of forfeiture and impose an order of restitution on you in the amount of \$5,549,017, to be payable in monthly installments of 35 percent of your gross monthly income over the period of your supervision.

I'm going to direct further as a special condition

that any and all proceeds earned by the firm of Julien & Schlesinger or the cases that you transferred to your son, that all of those monies be paid to the clerk of court in restitution, any fees that your firm earned.

I'm also, of course, imposing the mandatory \$100 special assessment.

This constitutes the sentence of this Court. I advise you that to the extent you've not previously waived your right to appeal, you have the right to appeal. I advise you further that if you cannot afford counsel, counsel will be provided to you free of cost.

Mr. Richman has done the very best that he can in representing you. I thought that his remarks today were entirely forthright -- something that you're incapable of being.

Now you may be seated.

Are there any further applications?

MR. LAROCHE: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. RICHMAN: If the Court please, I ask for the defendant to be considered for direct surrender. I have discussed it with the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: What is the government's view?

MR. LAROCHE: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I think that Mr. Schlesinger needs to begin serving his term of imprisonment, and so I'll

give him the benefit of spending Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur with his family, but I'm going to direct that he surrender to the United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York on Thursday, October 13, at 2 p.m., to begin serving his sentence.

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, most respectfully, I understand the concerns you have. The issue is about whether he'll be designated by the Bureau of Prisons.

THE COURT: I don't know whether he will be, but I don't know where that 2.2 million is either, all right? So it's time. He'll surrender here, to the Marshals.

Anything further?

MR. RICHMAN: Your Honor, one further request, that I'd ask your Honor to consider the designation -- I understand it's not binding on the Bureau of Prisons -- but that you consider the possibility of, just for the family's sake, that he be sent to Otisville Correctional Facility.

MR. RICHMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Anything further?

MR. LAROCHE: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Richman?

MR. RICHMAN: Nothing, sir.

THE COURT: This matter is concluded. (Adjourned)